

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 and 31-37 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed, claims 9-12, 14-20, 31 and 32 having been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to an earlier Restriction Requirement. Claims 1-4, 21, 22, 25, 33, 34, 36 and 37 have been amended by the present response to clarify certain aspects of these claims. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 13, 21-26 and 33-37 are currently under consideration in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 13, 21-26 and 33-37 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the claims in view of the present Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 1, 2-6, 8, 13, 21-24, and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,320,307 to Spofford et al. ("Spofford");

(B) Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art; and

(C) Claims 7 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on January 23, 2006, to discuss the present Office Action. During the course of the telephone conference, the parties discussed a number of distinctions between the pending claims and the applied Spofford reference. For example, the undersigned attorney pointed out that Spofford failed to teach or suggest, at least, the unitary fitting of claim 1 that transferred at least approximately all of the primary loads from an external structure to a wing. In addition, the undersigned attorney further pointed out that the Spofford reference also failed to teach or suggest a unitary fitting having a first attach feature that transfers at least a portion of the pitch loads from an external structure to a wing, and a second attach feature that transfers at least a portion of the side loads from

the external structure to the wing. At the conclusion of the telephone conference, the Examiner acknowledge that the Spofford reference failed to teach or suggest at least the foregoing features of claim 1, in addition to the third and fourth bores of claim 6. The Examiner requested, however, that at least independent claims 1 and 21 be amended to remove the "configured to" language to further clarify how the claimed inventions distinguish over the applied references. In an effort to expedite prosecution, the applicant has elected to amend claims 1-4, 21, 22, 25, 33, 34, 36, and 37 as requested by the Examiner.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 030048102US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: FEB 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen E. Arnett

Registration No.: 47,392

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant